Remarks

In response to the final Office Action mailed on April 28, 2006 and the Advisory Action mailed on July 12, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, independent claims 1, 10, 17, and 24 have been amended to clarify that the wire center identifier identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals, the selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location, and to specify providing a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network, the matrix including a plurality of service type fields for identifying different telecommunications services provided in the telephone network, a plurality of facility type fields for identifying facilities having different transmission characteristics, and a spare field for identifying a number of spare circuits for each of the plurality of facility types, wherein the matrix displays a number of circuits for each of a plurality of service types which are being served from each of the plurality of facility types and a number of the different telecommunication services which are capable of being provisioned for each of the plurality of service types based on the number of spare circuits. Support for these amendments may be found in Figure 2 and paragraphs 0046, 0108-109 and 0123-0126 in the Specification. No new matter has been added

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanschagrin et al. (US 6,295,540, hereinafter "Sanschagrin") in view of Farris et al. (US 5,881,131, hereinafter "Farris) in view of Grau et al. (US 5,910,803, hereinafter "Grau") in view of Austin et al. (US 5,500,934, hereinafter "Austin") and further in view of

Crawford ("Windows 2000 Pro: The Missing Manual). Claims 10-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanschagrin in view of Grau in view of Austin in view of Farris and further in view of Crawford.

Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between the undersigned and the Examiner was held on October 2, 2006 to discuss the rejection of independent claim 1 over the combination of the Sanschagrin, Farris, Grau, Carley, Austin, and Crawford references. In the interview, a discussion was held with respect to proposed amendments to the claims to clarify that a wire center identifier identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals, that a selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location, and to specify providing a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network, the matrix including a plurality of service type fields for identifying different telecommunications services provided in the telephone network, a plurality of facility type fields for identifying facilities having different transmission characteristics, and a spare field for identifying a number of spare circuits for each of the plurality of facility types, wherein the matrix displays a number of circuits for each of a plurality of service types which are being served from each of the plurality of facility types and a number of the different telecommunication services which are capable of being provisioned for each of the plurality of service types based on the number of spare circuits. The Examiner agreed that the aforementioned features, if claimed, would overcome the cited references of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9

Claims 1-9 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sanschagrin in view of Farris, Grau, Carley, Austin, and Crawford. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method of managing telephone network facilities. The method includes accessing a first computer having LEIS loaded thereon; extracting from LEIS information from a plurality of first tables, the information being in the form of individual records with each record including a field that includes a wire center identifier, wherein the wire center identifier identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals, the records specifying slots per piece of equipment, equipment per location, locations per wire center; formatting the extracted information into a pipe-delimited flat file, compressing the flat file, tarring the flat file, and porting the compressed and tarred information of the flat file to a second computer by a file transfer protocol; loading, from the second computer, the information of the compressed and tarred flat file into a relational database by untarring and uncompressing the flat file and storing the information from the table such that the information of the relational database is organized according to the wire center identifier of each of the records; manipulating the relational database to populate a plurality of second tables with data representative of telephone network facilities where such second tables are organized by wire center; displaying at least a portion of the data in the second tables via a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface providing a prompt for a district wherein multiple wire centers exist for each district, and in response to receiving a district, listing the available wire centers for the district, and upon receiving a selection of the available wire centers, accessing the information from the relational

database based on the wire centers selected to thereby display for each selected location of the wire center that is selected the individual pieces of equipment, the T1 circuits available, the T1 circuits working, the total T1 circuits, the ADSL circuits available, the ADSL circuits working, and the total ADSL circuits, wherein the selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location, with the information of each location being displayed in a separate window, and with the windows of the locations being cascaded; and providing a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network, the matrix including a plurality of service type fields for identifying different telecommunications services provided in the telephone network, a plurality of facility type fields for identifying facilities having different transmission characteristics, and a spare field for identifying a number of spare circuits for each of the plurality of facility types, wherein the matrix displays a number of circuits for each of a plurality of service types which are being served from each of the plurality of facility types and a number of the different telecommunication services which are capable of being provisioned for each of the plurality of service types based on the number of spare circuits.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Sanschagrin, Farris, Grau, Carley, Austin, and Crawford fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the cited references fail to disclose a wire center identifier that identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals, that a selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location, and a matrix of

feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network, or a matrix including a plurality of service type fields for identifying different telecommunications services provided in the telephone network, a plurality of facility type fields for identifying facilities having different transmission characteristics, and a spare field for identifying a number of spare circuits for each of the plurality of facility types, wherein the matrix displays a number of circuits for each of a plurality of service types which are being served from each of the plurality of facility types and a number of the different telecommunication services which are capable of being provisioned for each of the plurality of service types based on the number of spare circuits.

Sanschagrin discusses improving the database accuracy of a telecommunications based inventory system by providing verification and automatic updates so that the inventory data is aligned with a record keeping system (col. 2, line 48 through col. 3, line 3). At col. 7, lines 11-30, the reference describes a compare/update logic model which determines a discrepancy type by comparing data returned from TIRKS and an integrated network management/manager (INM). The comparison is effected on a slot-by-slot basis to determine plug-in existence or not, if HECI is the same or different, circuit ID existence in the INM, and slot status (working or not working). The logic module further determines a record update processing required using an update rules table which allows a user to specify which discrepancy types are candidates for auto-updates, and determine whether a work order record details (WORD) should be sent using a user specific parameter.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Sanschagrin fails to disclose a wire center identifier that identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals, that a selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum

percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location, or discloses a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network, the matrix including a plurality of service type fields for identifying different telecommunications services provided in the telephone network, a plurality of facility type fields for identifying facilities having different transmission characteristics, and a spare field for identifying a number of spare circuits for each of the plurality of facility types, wherein the matrix displays a number of circuits for each of a plurality of service types which are being served from each of the plurality of facility types and a number of the different telecommunication services which are capable of being provisioned for each of the plurality of service types based on the number of spare circuits, as specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the Office Action references col. 4, lines 54-56 for allegedly teaching a wire center identifier (i.e., location/relay rack terminal identification or TID). However, even assuming arguendo that a TID represents a wire center identifier, there is no teaching of a TID or any other identification information which identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals. Thus, Sanschagrin fails to disclose the aforementioned features specified in amended claim 1.

Farris, discusses maintaining the existing connections and/or identifications to customer facilities for a particular location, and thus also fails to cure the deficiencies of Sanschagrin with respect to amended claim. For example, Farris fails to disclose that a selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location, or a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in the telephone network. Grau discusses a network mapping tool for organizing and displaying topological data, however, Grau fails to cure the

deficiencies of Sanschagrin and Farris. For example, Grau fails to disclose that a selected location is displayed against a colored background, the color corresponding to a range comprising a minimum percentage and a maximum percentage of the T1 circuits in use at the location. Carley discusses sending a notification when multiple users attempt to alter the same data in a health care environment, however, Carley fails to cure the deficiencies of Sanschagrin, Farris, and Grau. For example, Carley fails to disclose providing a matrix of feeder-distribution interface data in a telephone network. Austin discusses providing an interface between a computer and a computer user to provide comprehensive information to support a customer's tasks with minimal impact on real time processing, however, Austin fails to cure the deficiencies of Sanschargin, Farris, Grau, and Carley. For example, Austin fails to disclose a wire center identifier that identifies a geographical location of at least one central office which supplies a communications service to a plurality of remote terminals. Crawford discusses manipulating multiple windows using a taskbar, however, Crawford fails to cure the deficiencies of Sanschagrin, Farris, Grau, Carley, and Austin by failing to disclose any of the features specified above.

Based on the foregoing, claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-9 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 10-29

In the Office Action, claims 10-29 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sanschagrin in view of Grau in view of Austin in view of Farris and further in view of Crawford. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 10, 17, and 24 recite similar allowable features as found in amended claim 1 and discussed above and are therefore allowable over the combination of Sanschagrin, Grau, Austin, Farris, and Crawford for at least the same reasons. Therefore, these claims are also allowable and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 11-16, 18-23, and 25-29 depend from claims 10, 17, and 24 respectively. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of these dependent claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

The present amendment is being filed with a petition and payment for a three-month extension of time. Please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2006

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748